APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/192,674	11/16/1998	DANIELE BAGNI	PHN-16.762	1092

24737   7590   06/10/2003

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP
580 WHITE PLAINS RD
TARRYTOWN, NY   10591

EXAMINER
CHEN, WENPENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/192,674	BAGNI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wenpeng Chen	2624	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
       NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *please see the attachment*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-9*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Wenpeng Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2624

Examiner's Remark

1.   The After Final Request for Reconsideration was filed on 5/17/2002. However, it was received by Board Appeals and Interferences on 5/2/2003 and then was presented to the Examiner for consideration. Between 7/17/2002 and now, Notice of Appeal was filed on 6/18/2002, Appeal Brief was filed on 8/19/2002, and Examiner's Answer was mailed on 11/4/2002.

This Advisory is to respond to the After Final Request for Reconsideration filed on 5/17/2002.

Examiner's Responses

2.   The Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as explained below. Therefore, the arguments do not place the application in condition of allowance.

3.   The Applicants arguments can be summarized into two points.

-- (1) Ng in view of Haan et al. neither teaches nor suggests limitation A of " filtering (MVPF) every occurrence of the first motion vectors (MVc, MVl, MVr, MVa, MVb) to obtain second motion vectors (MV1, MV2, MV3, MV4) for second objects (8*8)."

-- (2) Ng in view of de Haan et al. neither teaches nor suggests limitation B of "generating prediction errors in dependence on said second motion vectors only."

These two arguments were similar to those presented in the Appeal Brief, paper #23, filed

on 8/19/2002. Therefore, the Examiner's responses to the arguments presented in this After Final

Request for Reconsideration are the same as those discussed in section (11) of the Examiner's

Answer, paper #24, mailed on 11/4/2002. Please see section (11) of the Examiner's Answer,

paper #24 for details of the responses.

For the above reasons, the arguments do not place the application in condition of

allowance.